UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

JUSTIN GUY, individually on behalf of himself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

Hon. Mark A. Goldsmith

Case No.: 20-cy-12734

v.

ABSOPURE WATER COMPANY, LLC,

a domestic limited liability company,

Detend	ant.		
			/

PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM REGARDING THE SMALL VEHICLE EXCEPTION'S ANALYSIS

Plaintiff, Justin Guy, on behalf of himself and the finally certified class of Opt-in Plaintiffs, hereby submits this memorandum pursuant to the Court's instructions at the December 4, 2023 Hearing, and states as follows.

The motor vehicles used by the employee must weigh at least 10,001 pounds for the MCA exemption to apply. 49 C.F.R. § 390.5. The small vehicle exception to the MCA exemption is a *de minimis* exception and drivers who operate small vehicles for 1% or more of their routes satisfy the threshold. *Oddo v. Bimbo Bakeries U.S.A., Inc.*, 391 F. Supp. 3d 466, 474 (E.D. Pa. 2019) (holding that plaintiffs satisfied the *de minimis* threshold to collect overtime under the small vehicle exception because they drove small vehicles for 1% or more of their trips)

(emphasis added). "Recent cases involving the small vehicle exception have also hued closely to this 1% threshold." *See Id.* at 473 (collecting cases). Courts in this Circuit apply the *de minimis* standard. *See Byers v. Care Transp. Inc.*, No. 13-cv-15174, 2015 WL 5608287, at *8 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 24, 2015). Critically, this Court and others routinely find that the de minimis standard is measured over the entirety of a drivers employment (i.e. by using an and not on a week-by-week) and the Parties have likewise stipulated that the measure held sufficient by the Court likewise applies to all of the Opt-in Plaintiffs. *See* ECF No. ____ (the Stipulation).

Specifically, this Court has already ruled that Plaintiff's small vehicle driving was more than de minimis, because he drove small vehicles two times per month, or roughly 9% of his routes. *See* ECF No. 109, PageID.4705. Thus, "Guy has shown that his work involving small vehicles was beyond a trivial or insignificant level of his work duties. *Id.* at PageID.4706; *see also Byers*, 2015 WL 5608287, at *8 n. 11 (application of the small vehicle exception applies once the *de minimis* concept is met). As such, any Opt-in who drives small vehicles for more than a *de minimis* amount of their routes – twice per month – meets the small vehicle exception. *See id.* Such reasoning is in line with *Minor v. Cent. Forest Prod., Inc.*, No. 3:19-CV-01631-CLS, 2021 WL 1102437, at *16 (N.D. Ala. Mar. 23, 2021) (Plaintiffs who transport property as a driver of a service vehicle or provide services to customers fall within the Small Vehicle Exception).

Such reasoning also serves the public policy considerations of the FLSA. A

workweek basis analysis would allow employers to skirt FLSA liability by gaming

the employee's small vehicles routes. Moreover, a week-by-week analysis as urged

by Defendant would be impracticable, especially where Defendant acknowledges

that it failed to maintain full and accurate records regarding the type of vehicle each

Plaintiff drove each day. Thus, a longer-term perspective, such as a monthly or

quarterly evaluation, the actual proportion of small vehicle use can be accurately

assessed. It would also lend more ease and credibility to employees who provide

estimates, thereby fulfilling the purpose of the FLSA.

For these reasons, the Court should enforce the Parties' stipulation that any

Opt-in Plaintiff who drove/drives small vehicles on more than a de minimis amount

of their routes – twice per month – meets the small vehicle exception.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 5, 2023December 5, 2023

/s/ Michael N. Hanna

Michael N. Hanna (P81462)

MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.

2000 Town Center, Suite 1900

Southfield, MI 48075

(313) 739-1950

mhanna@forthepeople.com

-and-

3

Andrew R. Frisch
MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
Andrew R. Frisch
8151 Peters Road, Suite 4000
Plantation, FL 33324
(954) WORKERS
afrisch@forthepeople.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on December 5, 2023, the foregoing document was filed using the CM/ECF system, which will send notice of same to all counsel of record.

/s/ Michael N. Hanna
Michael N. Hanna (P81462)
Attorney for Plaintiff